

Application No. 10/657,512  
Amendment dated MARCH 10, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated January 12, 2006

### REMARKS

The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated January 12, 2006. Claims 34, 36-38, 44-46, 51, 52, and 54-62 are pending in the Application. Applicant thanks Examiner for the allowance of claims 46, 51, 52 and 57-59. Claims 35 and 53 have been cancelled and claims 34, 44, 45, 60 and 61 have been amended with this Response.

### Drawings

As an initial matter, there is no indication of acceptance of the formal drawings filed with the Application on September 8, 2003 or the drawing amendments filed with the Response dated October 7, 2005 by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate whether the drawings are accepted in the next communication from the Office.

### Claim Objections

Claims 35, 44 and 45 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but the Office Action states that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. In response, claim 34 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 35, claim 35 has been cancelled, and claims 44 and 45 have been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 34. Applicant asserts that these amendments place these claims in condition for allowance.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

Claims 34, 36-38, 53-56 and 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall, U.S. Patent No. 4,266,154 in view of Millas, U.S. Patent No. 5,512,011. As mentioned above, Applicant asserts that claim 34 is now in condition for allowance. Because they are dependent on allowable claim 34 and because they recite additional patentably distinct elements, Applicant asserts that claims 36-38 and 54-56 are also allowable.

In addition, claims 60-62 were rejected as being unpatentable over Marshall in view of Millas. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 60 and 61 have been amended in order to recite that "the collector ring remains coupled to at least a portion of the electrical device when creating the groove in the surface of the collector ring." Applicant asserts that the

Application No. 10/657,512  
Amendment dated MARCH 10, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated January 12, 2006

combination of Marshall and Millas is missing at least this subject matter of claims 60 and 61, and these claims are allowable over the cited references. Because it is dependent on allowable claim 61 and because it recites additional patentably distinct elements, Applicant asserts that claim 62 is also allowable.


Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at (612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID L. CUTSFORTH

By his attorney,

Date: March 10, 2006

  
J. Scot Wickhem, Reg. No. 41,376  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420  
Telephone: (612) 677-9050  
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349